fered as if they were empirical propositions, but are revealed upon closer examination to be nothing of the kind. They are merely assertions that in situations a, b, c, . . . x, the actors in a given situation *will* do this or that. Within the context of an explicit theoretical framework such statements might be regarded as tentative propositions susceptible to eventual testing. In the form in which they are presented they are largely empty of meaning. As a whole the work takes on this cast. It is largely an exercise in empty classification.

DEANE E. NEUBAUER
University of Hawaii

Economic and Political Peace. By Shirley Telford. (Portland, Oregon: William and Richards, 1969. Pp. xiv, 224. $5.95.)

This is a remarkable book. It is at the same time a political treatise, a work of learning, and a hoax. I am not sure if it is not meant as a parody; the tone is dead serious but this may be part of the game. It is definitely a Marxist tract; all its scholarly quotations are from two authors, Marx and Engels. These are the only two names in the bibliography. Yet no Marxist of any denomination will probably agree to it.

Mrs. Telford, who professes to be a disciple of Eduard Heimann of the New School for Social Research, claims to have found a new interpretation of Marx's writings. Her message is simple: the new society that Marx had in mind centers around "associated production by competitive producers" (p. 1). It combines free markets with workers' ownership and self-government of the producers. This system "should come into existence by popular vote, not by a forceful overthrow of the capitalist-class" (p. 17).

This preference for a socioeconomic organization which has a large sector of workers' cooperation (similar to that of Yugoslavia) is of course not uncommon, at least among European Socialists. The unusual element in Mrs. Telford's argument is that she does not try to prove the superiority of this arrangement by reference to its merits, or by reference to known historical facts; her whole thesis rests upon extensive quotations from *Capital, Theories on Surplus Value, The Communist Manifesto* and so forth. This makes for odd reading.

The author rejects state communism, capitalism and national socialism and here again Marx and Engles are invoked, page after page. Even strict Marxists will be astonished by this slavish adherence to doctrine; they might want to throw in an occasional dictum from Lenin, Stalin, Mao or other Great Masters. Naturally, most Marxists will also object to Mrs. Telford's idea that the new society will come into being without any kind of revolution.

In her "Introduction" the author states that the Russian reforms of 1965 are said to follow the theories of Yevsei Liberman, but she believes this to be unwarranted; according to her, the economic reforms are due to an American publication: *The Confessions of a Girl Economist* (1963) by Shirley Telford. "Even though the Russians and others have failed to acknowledge me as the author of my new interpretation of Marx, at least they acknowledged the importance of the ideas by accepting them" (page x). She hopes to convince Mao, who, she says, still believes in central planning. In fact, in China a good deal of decentralization is going on, and I would not be surprised if Mrs. Telford believed that this is the result of the present book's publication in 1969 and that the *Confessions* may well have triggered the Cultural Revolution.

If Mrs. Telford had written a study on whether Marx was in favor of workers' cooperation or of central planning, her contribution might have been interesting, though it seems to me that even in this more modest setting her conclusion is not quite convincing. But the author's ambitions make the book look like a joke. I sincerely hope that it is meant as such.

JAN PEN
Groningen University, the Netherlands

L'Idéologie Libérale. By André Vachet. (Paris: Editions anthropos, n.d. Pp. 567. Price not given.)

"Liberalism," when it was the thought structure of the *rising* bourgeoise, was historically functional—in Marxist terms "progressive." In the works of recent authors, Mises and Hayek for example, it has become dysfunctional, historically and politico-economically. In the interim the word was transformed in the Anglo-American world, especially in the United States. Movements such as the New Deal appropriated it to mean reformism, even—indeed particularly—in the economic sphere. (To an extent this usage had already been en vogue in England in the era of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith—Gladstone's Liberalism was still pretty close to the authentic one, though in political theory T. H. Green, the later J. S. Mill, and earlier the Benthamites had laid the groundwork for this change.) This transformation of the term "liberalism," especially since it did not remain confined to the popular language of politics, has, I think, been unfortu-

nate. A "mere" matter of terminology, of course. But one which has not facilitated the teaching and studying of modern political thought, where agreement on "received" terms is of no mean importance and where the job of terminological reorientation represents, at best, a sacrifice of valuable time.

Monsieur Vachet's book traces the development of liberal thought in the traditional and authentic sense—bourgeois-capitalist thought. Very appropriately it is subtitled "the individual and his property." Employing C. B. MacPherson's term "possessive individualism" to characterize it, Vachet defines this dominant aspect of liberalism as the "priority of the requirements of the economic process over the expression of individual independence and interpersonal and social relations" (p. 510). Thus man becomes enslaved by the products of his labor and consequently by those social forces that control the means of production. (No intimation that this may occur also under non-"liberal" systems of political economy. But then Vachet is writing about liberalism, not socialism.) Quoting from Marx's *German Ideology* on this point, Vachet takes it for granted that the bourgeoisie presents its own interest as the universal interest of all members of society. (Which dominant class or ruling group does not?) Liberalism as a thought structure is the expression of this claim to universality. It is thus an "ideology"—in the Marxist sense.

M. Vachet does not ignore the emancipatory and civil libertarian aspect of liberalism—its "juristic freedoms," as the late Professor Franz L. Neumann called it, such as equality before the law—which lends a partial truth to this claim to universality, so that liberalism has never been *entirely* "ideological." But he sees this latter aspect as ancillary to, essentially in conflict with (he places much emphasis on the antinomies of liberalism) and dominated by the former. Nevertheless, he closes on the optimistic note obligatory to socialists of every variety: "Liberalism as ideology and as social practice contains a dynamism or mechanism tending to explode its original intentions and to create the conditions that will overcome it" (p. 513). Thus liberal ideology could not but give rise to the various strands of socialist theory. And in the history of mankind, liberalism's successes and failures have caused new social groups to create new forms of power capable of transforming society by virtue of the material abundance made possible by the "liberal" forces of production. Here, even if one is prepared to credit this rather orthodox faith in the possibility of a truly free and "rational" society, to the extent of commenting that the evidence is not yet in, one must add that it has been a long time in coming.

As Henri Lefebvre points out in his preface, this work represents a synthesis of philosophy, history, and sociology. The synthesis is a happy and successful one. The syncretic approach helps in placing the theories within their historical contexts; in emphasizing the contradictions within the system of thought taken as a whole; in tracing the social origins and pointing up the social effects of the ideas discussed. For a broad work of exposition rather than of specialized scholarship, the analyses are not only impressively thoughtful but also exhaustive, the presentation is always lucid and often profound. The argumentation is convincing; the coverage of source materials, the choice of categories, and the structure and organization of the tome are impeccable—though the latter appears, to an American reader, excessively schematized. I think this is what makes parts of the book rather heavy going, even for one to whom the subject matter is not unfamiliar.

Vachet presents his subject via the following categories: (1) the "themes" of liberalism: naturalism (i.e., the liberal versions of "nature" and "natural law"), rationalism, individualism; (2) the "theses" of liberalism: liberty, equality, property, public safety. Within this framework. he properly places his main emphasis on the thinkers of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—the Physiocrats, Locke, Adam Smith, the Encyclopedists. But he does not exclude other themes. He traces the origins of the liberal and secular ethic to the declining Middle Ages in the work of Duns Scotus and William of Occam. In his fine discussion of Hobbes he stresses, as too many others have failed to do, the role of Hobbesian "absolutism" in the making of the bourgeois-individualist tradition, and he stresses as well Hobbes's affinities with Locke, which are at least as important as the frequently overstated differences between them.

I would fault the book on only two related points: Though all the terrain Vachet takes us over is relevant, some of it has already been very well charted, so that one feels the volume could have been more compact, particularly as there is a bit too much paraphrasing and quoting from secondary works. For example, the often debated relationship between Calvinism-Puritanism and the capitalist spirit is rather too much belabored by leaning on Tawney (Weber is neglected). Laski's *tour de force, The Rise of*

European Liberalism, also receives more attention as a source than necessary. Other examples could be given.

Even if the work as a whole cannot be called an original contribution to scholarship, parts of it are indeed of that sort, and others excel in their analysis and formulation. I think a skillful translation of this book—not an easy task!—would be a real boon to American students in the field

FREDERIC S. BURIN
Villars-sur-Ollon, Switzerland

New Perspectives on Organization Theory: An Empirical Reconsideration of the Marxian and Classical Analyses. By William A. Zwerman. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1970. Pp. XX, 219. $11.50.)

Marxist Sociology in Action: A Sociological Critique of the Marxist Approach to Industrial Relations. By J. A. Banks. (Harrisburg, Pa.: Stackpole Books, 1970. Pp. 324. $11.50.)

During the last hundred years Marxist theories have appeared in many roles and have been applied for various purposes. Recently some social scientists have tended to translate them into nonideological, purely scientific theoretical models and have hoped to use them as a means to overcome the parochiality and lack of coherence of empirical research; the books of Zwerman and Banks are good examples of this approach, through their methodological procedures are basically different.

Zwerman confronts his empirical findings, assembled without any theoretical presumptions, with Marxist and classical business theory; Banks has taken some of Marx's theoretical theses as his point of departure and has looked for empirical data which might verify or contradict them.

Zwerman's empirical findings are an extension and amplification, on the basis of American data, of the now famous investigations of the English sociologist, Joan Woodward. Professor Woodward had proved that in British industry technological factors determined fundamental organizational features, such as the style of management, shape and form of organization, and character and application of the labor force. Zwerman's research confirmed the validity of almost all of Joan Woodward's findings and are in this respect a tribute to the methodology employed and hypotheses put forward by this outstanding British scholar.

As far as America is concerned, Zwerman is basically right in saying that, with few exceptions, scholars engaged in the analysis of formal organizations have typically played down the pioneering work done by Marx in this field and have almost entirely eliminated Marx's theoretical perspective; conservative business management theory and functional analysis have nearly monopolized formal organization theory. Therefore, Zwerman's research will probably contribute a great deal to the shaping of new theoretical perspectives in American organization theory.

It must be mentioned that in Europe, however, the interest in technological determinants of organizational structures is general among industrial sociologists. Europeans will primarily appreciate in Zwerman's study the introduction of new variables that are highly important in contemporary industry, namely the relationship between ownership and management, the ratio of nonmanagerial supervisors to managerial staff, and the dependence on local markets. All readers will appreciate the exactitude and rigor of Zwerman's empirical approach and the elegance of his presentation.

Banks deals in his book with much wider and more general problems than Zwerman. In his deliberations on Marxist theory he proceeds from the most general assumptions to theses referring to rather specific, middle-range problems. His opinion is that the most general premises of Marxism, such as Marx's theory of social change, were not susceptible to empirical verification. He apparently believes the same was true of Marx's less general theses, such as the theory of capitalism. The theses referring to specific problems are considered by Banks as either a conversion of the processes of social change under capitalism into recognizable relationships between social classes or as the application of the more general premises of the theory of capitalism to specific problems of industrial relations. It is on that lower level that he does regard Marx's theses as verifiable by empirical procedures.

In order to verify Marx's assumptions Banks has used statistical data, results of economic analyses, and historical-descriptive studies; thus his investigations are free from the onesidedness of survey and questionnaire methods. He seems to be aware of the numerous gaps and shortcomings of the available sources. He has been remarkably successful in avoiding this difficulty by relating some points of his analysis to the British iron and steel industry about which an enormous wealth of primary sources, including good monographs, was available.

Banks deals in his book with problems which